

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office communication of April 19, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 9, 13, and 17 have been amended. No new matter is added. Claims 1-20 remain in this application.

Claims 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Naoyuki (JP 2000-200147). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 13, as amended, recites a sensor for detecting pivotal displacement of the scroll wheel relative to the housing for a continuous period of time, wherein the image scrolls in the second direction at a first speed if the continuous period of time is less than or equal to a predetermined period of time, otherwise, the image scrolls at a second speed, the second speed being greater than the first speed.

Naoyuki discloses a non-rotatable stick 212 that can be moved in multiple directions and a scroll wheel 202 that is rotatable in a rotating plane. However, Naoyuki fails to teach or suggest detecting displacement of a scroll wheel for a continuous period of time and scrolling an image at a first speed or second speed depending on the continuous period of time. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element is set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). In the present case, Naoyuki fails to teach or suggest each and every element. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted the rejection of claim 13 should be withdrawn. Claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 13 and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth for claim 13.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naoyuki (JP 2000-200147). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 16 depends from claim 13 and is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 13.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pruchniak (U.S. Patent No. 6,075,518) in view of Naoyuki. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a sensor for detecting an extension force based on the pivotal movement of said rotatable member about the second axis for scrolling the image in a second scrolling direction perpendicular to the first scrolling direction, wherein the image is operable to scroll in the second direction responsive to the detected extension force.

Naoyuki merely discloses a scroll wheel and a stick but fails to teach or suggest scrolling an image in a second direction responsive to a detected extension force. Indeed, Naoyuki fails to teach or suggest an extension force at all. Pruchniak also fails to teach or suggest detecting an extension force or an image operable to scroll in a second direction response to a detected extension force. Because the combination of Naoyuki and Pruchniak fails to teach or suggest claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 1. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In addition, claim 3, as amended, recites a finger-engagable control member including raised side edges and a concave recessed center section. None of the cited references, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests this feature. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted the rejection of claim 3 should be withdrawn.

Claims 9-12 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pruchniak in view of Naoyuki. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 is similar to claim 1 and is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 1. Claims 10-12 depend from claim 9. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 9-12 should be withdrawn.

Claim 17 is similar to claim 13. As set forth above, Naoyuki fails to teach or suggest claim 13. Pruchniak, either alone or in combination with Naoyuki, fails to teach or suggest claim 13. Pruchniak also fails to teach or suggest a sensor positioned within said housing for sensing a period of time of lateral displacement of the rotatable member or a signal to scroll the image across the display screen at a first speed if the period of time is less than or equal to a predetermined period of time, otherwise scrolling the image at a second speed, the second speed being greater than the first speed.

Atty. Docket No. 003797.00717  
Serial No. 10/760,466

Because the combination of Pruchniak and Naoyuki fails to teach or suggest claim 17, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 18-20 depend from claim 17 and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 17.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: May 19, 2006

By: 

Darrell G. Mottley  
Registration No. 42,912

1001 G Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001